

REMARKS

In the December 22, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-18 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1-8, 15, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e); and rejected claims 9-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 5,832,527 to Kawaguchi; 6,185,574 to Howard et al.; 6,195,695 to Cheston et al.; 6,018,741 to Howland et al.; (References A-E, respectively, in the April 23, 2004 Office Action); 6,208,991 to French et al.; and 6,507,813 to Veditz et al. (References A and B, respectively, in the December 22, 2004 Office Action) were cited. Claims 1-18 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Newly Cited Prior Art**U.S. Patent 6,208,991 to French et al.**

The French et al. patent is directed to "dynamic file mapping [that] allows single-user applications, those designed for use by only one user at a time, to be shared from a single network location, with user-specific files mapped to different locations for different users" (col. 1, last line to col. 2, line 4). A redirector allows a client device to access a file by dynamically finding a correlation between a network file system associated with distributed servers and a client view described in a table called a file-map. No description of any operations by an "administrative user" has been found in column 3 or elsewhere.

U.S. Patent 6,507,813 to Veditz et al.

The Veditz et al. patent is directed to a system and method for national language support, i.e., "accommodating a specific country's language, conventions, and culture" (column 1, lines 28-29). Column 21, lines 1-10 which were cited in rejecting the claims describes step 513 in Fig. 5D and dialog box 610 in Fig. 6A which relate to a warning message that is displayed if "the index file about to be opened does not have an assigned language driver" (column 21, lines 4-5) and the user has the options of canceling, reindexing or using an existing index (see Fig. 6A). As illustrated in Fig. 2A, data object 201 includes a header 210 with a language driver identifier LDID that is referenced by language configurator 230 to select an appropriate language driver from stored language drivers 240.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102(e)

In item 1 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 15, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by French et al. In making these rejections, it was asserted that "setting policy attribute data specifying file usage, determined by an administrative user, in correspondence with path information of a directory" (e.g., claim 1, lines 3-4), was disclosed by "user-specific file/directory mappings 120a-120n, Fig 1B, col. 3, lines 1-60" (Office Action, page 2, line 3). However, nothing was cited or has been found in French et al. teaching or suggesting anything that is done by "an administrative user" (e.g., claim 1, lines 3-4). As noted in the Amendment filed August 23, 2004, conventional operating systems like UNIX do not provide a file system administrator with the ability to control the disk on which a file is stored, restrictions on the file usage for a group of users, etc. Nothing has been found in French et al. suggesting that the operating system described therein differs from the conventional capabilities with respect to the control given to system administrators.

Claim 2 includes a limitation like that quoted above from claim 1 and claims 15 and 16 recite "a policy, determined by an administrative user" on line 3. Claims 17 and 18 have been amended to recite "file usage specified by an administrative user" on lines 4 and 5. Since the remaining claims depend from claim 1 or claim 2, it is submitted that all of the claims patentably distinguish over French et al. taken alone for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Rejections under 35 USC § 013(a)

In the last full paragraph on page 4 and the paragraph spanning pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over French et al. in view of Howard et al. Nothing was cited or has been found in Howard et al. suggesting modification of French et al. to overcome the deficiencies discussed above and in the August 23, 2004 Amendment. Since claim 12 depends from claim 1, it is submitted that claim 12 patentably distinguishes over French et al. in view of Howard et al. for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

On pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over French et al. in view of Howard et al. and further in view of Cheston et al. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1 via claim 12 and nothing was cited or has been found in Cheston et al. suggesting modification of French et al. in view of Howard et al. that would overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, as discussed in the August 23, 2004 Amendment with respect to modification of Kawaguchi et al., it

is submitted that the combination of French et al. in view of Howard et al. and Cheston et al. does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 13 and 14.

In the last paragraph on page 6 and the paragraphs on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over French et al. in view of Veditz et al. As noted above, Veditz et al. does not include anything relevant to operations performed by an administrative user. Therefore, it is submitted that Veditz et al. does not provide any teaching or suggestion to modify French et al. to overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to claim 1 from which claims 9 and 10 depend. Thus, it is submitted that claims 9 and 10 patentably distinguish over French et al. in view of Veditz et al. for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In the first two paragraphs on pages 8 of the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over French et al. in view of Kawaguchi. Since the independent claims were not rejected as anticipated by Kawaguchi, it is assumed that the Examiner has acknowledged that, as discussed in the August 23, 2004 Amendment, Kawaguchi fails to disclose a policy set by an administrative user as recited in the independent claims. As discussed above, French et al. also fails to teach this feature of the present invention. Furthermore, it is submitted that combining French et al. and Kawaguchi similarly fails to teach or suggest this feature of the present invention. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 11 which depends from claim 1 patentably distinguishes over French et al. in view of Kawaguchi for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

On the bottom half of page 8 and the first eight lines of page 9, claim 17 was rejected as unpatentable over Kawaguchi in view of Howland et al. As noted above, claims 17 and 18 have been amended to include a limitation similar to that recited in the other independent claims regarding "file usage specified by an administrative user" (claims 17 and 18, lines 4-5). Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 18 as unpatentable over the combination of Kawaguchi in view of Howland et al. is respectfully requested for the same reason that these two references were not used to reject the other independent claims.

Entry of Amendment

As noted in the preceding paragraph and previously, claims 17 and 18 were amended to include a limitation similar to that previously recited in other independent claims. Therefore, no "new matter" has been introduced to the claims which might require a further search. Therefore, there is no reason to deny entry of this Amendment. Furthermore, the number of issues on

appeal have been reduced by eliminating the combination of Kawaguchi and Howland et al. in rejecting the claims. For the above reasons, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the applied art does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-18 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5/23/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 5/23/2005
STAAS & HALSEY Richard A. Gollhofer
By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Date: 5/23/05